

The
Harmony of Science
and the
Scriptures



By
HARRY RIMMER, President
RESEARCH SCIENCE BUREAU, Inc.
5141 Crenshaw Boulevard
Los Angeles, Calif.



The
Harmony of Science
and the
Scriptures



By
HARRY RIMMER, President
RESEARCH SCIENCE BUREAU, Inc.
5141 Crenshaw Boulevard
Los Angeles, Calif.

Copyright 1927 by
Research Science Bureau, Inc.

THE HARMONY OF SCIENCE AND THE SCRIPTURES

FOREWORD

In the universe which is known to man, there are two revelations of the God Who is the Author of all existing things. If a man has the power to read the signature of Deity in the works that He has wrought, he may find God there. But so few are able to thus read the knowledge of the Creator in His creation, that a fuller and simpler revelation is needed. This transcendent setting forth we see in the revelation of God's mind and message known as the Bible. As the omnipotent God is the Author of all created things, so He is the Author of this Book. It follows as an elemental fact, that the Word of God and the works of God must agree.

It would be academically incorrect to speak of the Bible vs. Science, or visa versa, as there could never be a fact of knowledge that is in conflict with revelation. I am amazed as I go from school to school to find how many erroneously believe the Bible and modern research science to be at hopeless variance in fundamental statements and facts. Science and the Bible are not in conflict—they are each supplemental to the other. Wherever a **proved** fact of science is touched by any of the Scripture writers the two are in **ABSOLUTE AGREEMENT**.

This fact is of paramount importance. We believe God made the world and all things therein. We also know He dictated the Book and all things therein. So then He is the Author of both creation and record, therefore the two must agree; and they do agree in spite of what the ignorant may say to the contrary.

Dr. R. A. Millikan, director of the Norman Bridge Laboratory of the California Institute of Technology, formulated the following statement:

"The purpose of Science is to develop without prejudice of preconception of any kind, a knowledge of the facts, the laws and the processes of nature. The even more important task of religion, on the other hand, is to develop the consciences, the ideals and the aspirations of mankind."

In his recent thought-provoking book, "The Strength of Religion as Shown by Science," Dr. Chas. E. deM. Sajous says, "The view that science is in antagonism with religion or that it excludes belief in the supernatural is old-fashioned and out of date. A quarter of a century ago such a view was held widely, but science has left it behind." After many such characteristic attempts to show that science is in perfect accord with the Christian revelation, Dr. Sajous makes this clear and positive statement, . . . "SCIENCE IS ACTING AS BEACON FOR THE GREAT PATHWAY TO GOD, THE BIBLE."

Man's knowledge is constantly changing. The so-called "Fact" of today is the discredited theory of to-morrow. We jump at conclusions. I pick up the early morning paper and read of a terrible collision; a ferry-boat has gotten off her course in the fog and rammed a liner and one hundred fifty souls are lost. The details are meager.

I pick up the late evening paper and the story is corrected. There was a collision, but it was between the ferry boat and a small launch and two occupants of the launch were rescued after a severe ducking. My, what a difference fuller knowledge makes! (Note: This is a literal fact—I did read it just this way.)

How many times in just the past twelve months have we read of some marvelous discovery of science that was announced in screaming headlines in the morning of excitement as disproving the old things of Christian faith! A tooth was found in Nebraska, and after being submitted to every known test was given the dignified name of *Hesperopithicus Haroldcookii*, and was positively stated to be the sole remnant of a pre-historic man who lived at least one million years ago. In the famous Dayton trial this was repeatedly cast in the teeth of the late Mr. Bryan as an evidence of the antiquity of man and a proof of the fallacy of the Genesis story of creation; but the year 1928 had scarcely dawned before it was proved conclusively that this tooth came from an extinct species of wild pig!

The morning tales and the evening fact: how different they are when we compare them. It is not necessary to extend this idea further here, as I have covered the point fully in another work.

So I say while scientific opinion is constantly changing, we do not have to attempt a harmony of truth and opinion. We make a mistake when we attempt to test Bible truth by science: the reverse should be the process. Test science by the Bible! If the two agree, the science is true: if not, wait. In a varying space of time men will move on again from the wrong theory, and you will not have to change your faith. How often have we laughed at folks who knew so little they gave up their Bible for a scientific theory the scientists themselves gave up in less than one year. Scientific opinion changes. The Book endures! In a future article I hope to call attention to this shifting front of scientific theory and deal in a detailed way with some of the more ridiculous fantasies of scientific

thought now long since rejected by scientists, but occasionally advanced by the ignorant as "evidences" of the fallibility of the Bible. This however must be a separate theme. I merely pause now to call your attention to this fact:

Opinions change and knowledge grows but the Word of God remains steadfast—immovable. And finally:—

A review of the history of the various schools of scientific thought shows an annoying civil war in the ranks of the scientists themselves! One science against another—man against man—school against school—theory against theory! A more bitter controversy now rages and always has raged between different kinds of "Scientists" than ever raged between the schools of Revelation and Science.*

Before science can assail the Word of God—science will have to decide its own fallacies and arguments and unite on some one unchanging basis! Until they agree among themselves, why ask us to agree with them?

Query: Who among you is so simple as to cast aside a Book that has remained unchanged for two thousand years for theories that change every two years?

So then, let us put first things first. If we are to do any comparing or judging, let us proceed in the logical order, and instead of judging the Bible by science, make science, the lesser, conform to the Bible!

"The purpose of science is to develop, without prejudice of preconception of any kind, a knowledge of the facts, the laws, and the processes of nature. **THE EVEN MORE IMPORTANT TASK** of religion is
*See: *"Modern Science and the Youth of Today."*

to develop the consciences, the ideals, and the aspirations of mankind."

Without any discussion of the accuracy of this conception of the function of religion, let us agree as to this, that science and Christian faith move in totally different spheres, and that science is the lesser in import. It is an established principle that the lesser is judged in all cases by the greater; so on what ground can we judge the Bible by science? The reverse should be the logical process.

Some time ago I was reading one of the fascinating books by Dr. E. E. Slosson of "Science Service" entitled "Sermons of a Chemist." One of the most gripping sentences in many is this:

"Science is moulting, and right now it looks funny. But I wish we could get the world to realize that this changing face is an evidence of growth, and not decay."

That is a trenchant statement, and truly phrased. I am glad it was said just that way. Science IS growing. But as it is sometimes stated in the South, "The Bible is done growed!" And for a growing Science to criticize a grown Revelation would be like a seven-year-old boy telling a seventy-year-old man how to grow up!

Several years ago I made and published an offer of one hundred dollars in gold (which offer I here and now renew) to be paid to any person who can produce one scientific fallacy in the Bible. Several people from several places answered but none ever has found a real scientific fallacy in the Book. Most of the hopeful ones withdrew their remarks, some failed because new facts were dug up while their mail was in transit, but all established this fact: "All apparent scientific fallacies in the Word of God are the illusion of the finder's ignor-

ance!" Some were ignorant of the plain statements of the Bible and so failed there. Others were ignorant of the true facts of science and so were confused. It is a self-evident fact we cannot reconcile ignorance with ignorance, or error with truth, and make the two coincide.

Again; I once heard a Bible Teacher (?) (!) say: "Scientific mistakes in the Bible do occur, for the purpose of the Bible is not scientific; therefore these mistakes may be excused." I would like to take sharp issue here. The Bible is not a book of science but is a scientific Book. When the Bible does speak on a question of science, it speaks with the same absolute infallibility it possesses when it speaks concerning history or faith! For regardless of the purpose of the Book, the God who wrote it knew the facts and would keep His Book free from error.

Once more:

Only a true interpretation of the Bible can be made to agree with a scientific knowledge that is free from error. May I give you a definition of "science."

A science is a correlated body of **ABSOLUTE KNOWLEDGE**.

When our knowledge of a subject becomes absolute (as far as it goes) we classify and correlate it under that particular head and then it becomes the "science" of that particular field. Now you see, we limit the horizon. There is much speculation and theory that is not science. I hold no brief for the harmony of the Bible and opinion, for theories do not harmonize with themselves. But I do insist on a perfect agreement between God's Word and proved facts concerning His works.

THE SCIENTIFIC TRUTH OF THE BIBLE

Four Great Facts

Fact I.

The argument has been advanced that the Bible does not use scientific language, therefore the writers could not have known scientific facts. The reasoning is faulty. The Bible does not use scientific language for two reasons:

First—Scientific terminology renders the subject unintelligible to the mass of the people. As an instance: Some time ago I had an expedition in research work in American archaeology excavating in Kings County in California. Among the party was a young pre-medical student who had a keen sense of humor. He never lacked for an answer to any question, nor allowed time to hang on our hands. One night he got us all busy translating the old darky song "Uncle Ned" into scientific terms. Try it some time for a game. Write this line: "There was an old nigger and his name was Uncle Ned" in scientific language! One of his translations sticks in my mind. He gave us this line—

"He had no hair on the top of his head,

In the place where the hair ought to grow."

Translated into scientific language, the line read like this: "He had no follicle appendages on the cutaneous apex of his cranial structure, anterior to the lhomdoidal suture and posterior to the sagital suture where said follicle appendages habitually germinate!"

Now isn't that a classic way of saying "He was bald?" The language of the Bible was and is for the common people; yet in scientific language a man's shin is called "the anterior cutaneous border Tibialus." Try that on your phonograph but not on your ten-year-old

child. Yet even a ten-year-old child can understand John 3:16.

So the Bible does not contain scientific language first of all because the Bible was meant to be read, and heard, and understood by all men everywhere.

Second—The absence of scientific language in the Bible is further proof of its authenticity.

Language is the vehicle of man's expression of thought, invented at need. We change our language constantly to meet new views of fresh knowledge. We add new words every year. If I have a book purporting to date from 1750 A. D. and in that book I find the sentence "He went out to the garage and cranked up his flivver" I know the book to be a forgery. The word "flivver" was not coined until after the "flivver" was created. This simple illustration makes clear this point—the Bible could not contain modern scientific language until modern scientific facts were generally known. But that they were known to the author of the Bible I will clearly show when we come to Fact IV. The conclusion of Fact I is—while the Bible does not use scientific language, its statements are never in opposition to scientific facts.

Fact II.

The Bible is free from ancient scientific errors.

I once heard a man apologize for the Book saying each section had been written by men under the influence and subject to the limitations of various "cultures." Thus Isaiah wrote under Egyptian culture, as did Moses, Daniel under Babylonian culture, Nehemiah under Median Persian culture and so on. Each of these men did the best they could under their limitations and in their environment; but we couldn't expect ancient

"cultures" to have the perfection of "modern cultures."

It hasn't been so long ago they were saying Moses couldn't write at all! Now they criticize his "culture!" How wonderful it is to see the great unshakable modern products of "our culture" displace the outworn writings of the ancient. The Pentateuch for instance. What modern book will be put in its place? Well's "Outline of History?" Perish the thought!

We do know that the Prophets wrote under the influence of many "cultures" but they all wrote under the inspiration of the same Spirit! Moses for instance "was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians." But we seek in vain for any of their scientific errors in his writings. At great pains I have searched the records of ancient sciences and I find many weird and fantastic errors therein. None of these are in the Scripture written at that time. I seek to emphasize this fact. The Bible does not contain the scientific fallacies common to its age of production. Let us look into the case of Moses who "was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians." What was this wisdom Moses possessed?

Geology:—The Egyptians believed the earth was hatched from a winged egg. This egg flew about in space until the heat of the sun hatched it out. This was "scientific" and generally believed in that day. Now what says Moses? Read it—Genesis 1: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth!"

Anthropology—The Egyptians were evolutionists. This is not a modern error. The Egyptians held that man was hatched out of white worms that were in the slime of the Nile. They taught a state of metamorphosis—such as the butterfly and moth experience. This also Moses knew. When writing under this "cul-

ture" did he incorporate this error in his Book? Read it and see. "So God made man: in His own image and likeness made He him!" These words deserve greater analysis than we now have space for: we may come back to them again. Now we merely show how Moses' record was kept free from scientific fallacy.

Theology:—The faith of Egypt was a confused state of jumbled pantheism, yet when Moses wrote "under the influence of this culture" he wrote such a grand and mighty record of One God that the monotheistic world accepts that conception today. Query! In a pantheistic culture, where did Moses learn Monotheism?

Astronomy:—The Egyptians taught that the sun was a great crystal reflecting the light of the earth. Did Moses so say? In Genesis 1:17 Moses reverses his "knowledge" and says the sun lights the earth! Moses was taught the stars were a mixture of fire and glue yet how wondrously he describes the truth in Genesis 1:16! This is the Moses who was "learned in all this wisdom of the Egyptians" who was the amanuensis of God in recording Truth so widely known to-day.

As Moses stands out in Egyptian culture, so the other Scripture writers stand out in their days and times. They did write under various cultures, but kept their writings free from error and fallacy. See the teaching of Chaldean "culture" about geology. They believed the earth to be a living creature with trees for hair and grass for fur. Men they thought were vermin, like fleas on a dog. This much for Chaldean anthropology! Did the prophets of Chaldean times so speak? Search and see!

There were prophets who wrote in Babylonian times and under Babylonian culture and influences, but

they kept their writing free from all scientific error and fallacies. Consider the Babylonian culture concerning geology. The story of creation as told from Babylonian sources may be briefly stated here:—

The great God Marduk slew the chaos-monster Tiamatt in deadly combat. Having no place to put the body, he rolled it up and stepped on it, mashing it flat. Not desiring to see such a great mass go to waste, he peopled it with men and animals, so ever since, the race has dwelt on an immense corpse.

Certainly, there were prophets who wrote under such educational and scientific influence as this. But which of them has incorporated such fallacy and falsehood in his writings? The Spirit of God forbade the error of man entering God's Book, and we do not find ancient ignorance paraded in these pages.

Here is a simple illustration: All ancient men, up to the fifteenth century, believed the earth was flat. Gallileo, Columbus, and a hardy band of fearless thinkers, braved the stake and the rack to testify to their new-found belief that the earth was round. It fell to the lot of the indomitable Columbus to prove this fact, but it was almost fifteen hundred years after Christ that the world's true shape was known.

While the race of man was generally agreed, however, that the earth was flat, the prophet Isaiah had occasion to refer to the matter. Is. 40:22. Did he say it was flat? On the contrary he said it was round! How did he know? He probably didn't, but the God who spoke through him DID know, and Isaiah wrote what was said through him.

Fact III.

It belongs right here. As the Bible has always been in opposition to ancient scientific error, so THE

BIBLE TODAY DISAGREES WITH MODERN SCIENTIFIC ERRORS AS WELL. This is the source of all the present controversy. We may as well face the fact. Men of science are the most intolerant and dogmatic set on the face of the earth, and any man or book that dares oppose their views must be consigned to the outer limbo at once.

The scientific world seems agreed that the theory of evolution is true. The Bible says it is false. So, as the Book dares to speak against this modern recrudescence of an ancient fallacy, the dogmatic evolutionist, confirmed in his error, says "Away with such a book from the earth!" But false theory has been saying this for almost four thousand years, and while each false teaching has gone into the silence of scholarly oblivion, the blessed Book endures. As we have published many things already on the collapse of this theory in true scientific research, I will content myself with this brief reference. Twenty years from now, when the whole world is laughing at our generation for such ridiculous credulity, where would the Bible be then, if it had not lifted its testimony against this foolishness? But it does: and so ignorance inveighs against it.

Fact IV.

I come now to the discussion of the fourth and last point in this series; one that will take a long time to set forth, and can never be entirely finished. The Bible and Science walk hand in hand, for

THE WORD OF GOD ANTICIPATES MANY MODERN SCIENTIFIC DISCOVERIES

I cannot take the time to say much on this head, as there are so many points to cover here. Indeed, we

can never exhaust this matter, because every new discovery of Science opens up the subject again. But we will look at one or two Scripture verses in the light of modern scientific knowledge and research.

There have been almost innumerable explanations given for the method of the creation of this earth, some of them weird and fantastic indeed. The age long contest between the Chemist and the Physicist now seems to be decidedly in favor of the latter, especially since modern methods of research have isolated and shattered the atom. The most recent theory of the earth's production is this:

"A NEBULOUS MASS OF PLASTIC MATTER 'SOMEHOW' HAD MOTION IMPARTED, which caused it to rotate more and more rapidly, until the fluid mass condensed into a globular form."

I agree with this as the most scientific and highest possible explanation Science can make. There was a FLUID MASS. Genesis 1:2—"And the earth was waste and void, and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the (fluid) waters." (Revised Version). Please note carefully here the word "moved." In the Hebrew language, the word here translated "moved" has very exact significance. It appears only three times in the entire Old Testament. Once it is translated "moved," once it is rendered "to flutter" and once again "to shake." The word is RACHAPH, and always means "TO IMPART MOTION." Now see the harmony here:

Science says: "There was a fluid mass, and SOMEHOW motion was imparted."

God's Word says: "There was a fluid mass, and THE HOLY SPIRIT imparted motion to it."

Less than a month ago I was conducting a series of meetings in the Southeastern section of Missouri.

As is always my custom, I offered to answer all questions submitted to me in writing, that had to do with the inspiration of the Bible and its harmony with science. One night a man submitted the following: "How can the Bible be inspired when it makes such ridiculous scientific mistakes? As an example I offer this: In Genesis 1:3 God said, 'Let there be light and there was Light,' but the sun does not appear until the fourteenth verse, on the fourth day. How could there be light before there was a sun?"

This is a typical example of the assaults made on the Bible by Ignorance in the name of science. Every man of science knows that there was light before there was a sun, and if the sun went out there would still remain that primeval light. It is called "COSMIC LIGHT," and it is an emanation given forth by all heavenly bodies.

There are many kinds of light other than sun light. Gas light, electric light, burning matter of all kinds that make "fire" give light, and MANY CHEMICAL COMBINATIONS EXUDE LIGHT. Phosphorus is a case in point, radium is another. Note, then, that while the Bible does not say the sun was CREATED on the fourth day it would still be scientifically justified in saying even, that there was light before the sun was created. For this cosmic glow was there, and there WAS light before the sun.

What, then, was the "fourth day" reference to the appearance of the sun? Let us see at once that it was not the creation but rather the manifestation. The earth in the preceding periods had been covered with a watery or vaporous blanket that the sun's rays could not penetrate.

The great planet Jupiter is in that stage or condi-

tion now. It is familiarly referred to as "the fourth day planet." The sun is there, shining in all its powers, but the rays do not yet reach the face of Jupiter.

The same condition obtains even now on foggy days. I have been in sea-port cities when the sun was not visible. A mist of fog blanketed the terrain, and even the headlights of automobiles were invisible a few feet away. Then, about the hour of noon the wind swept the cloud away, and the sun shown through. It was there all the time; created ages ago, but not until the fog lifted was it visible.

So with the "fourth creative day." On that day the veil was rent asunder, and the sun reached the surface of the earth. The first verse of Genesis records the sun's creation: in the fourteenth verse it breaks through the clouds that surround the earth.

Again see how the Word of God anticipated scientific discoveries. The science of Geology was not thought of until the year 1726, which was the year of the birth of James Hutton, who correlated the first principles of Geology as a science. He died in 1797, and his life work was taken up and advanced by William Smith until 1839, when he died. After the death of Dr. Smith in 1839 Sir Charles Lyell made some notable contributions until the year of his death, 1875. It is a comparatively modern and recent science. Practically all Geologists agree on the theory that there were SIX CREATIVE DAYS, called in Geology ERAS. Each of these Eras is divided into "Ages," which Ages are in turn divided into "Periods." These Periods are each known by what is called "dominant life."

I give the record of these six Creative days as it is accepted by the International Geological Congress.

I give of course, the most recent at the head of the column.

ERA	AGE	PERIOD	DOMINANT LIFE
Psychozoic	Eolithic	Recent	Man. (Genus Homo Sapiens).
Cenezoic	Quaternary	Pleistocene	Mammals
	Tertiary	Pliocene Miocene Oligocene Eocene	
Mesozoic	Secondary	Cretaceous Jurassic Triassic	Reptiles
Paleozoic	Carboniferous	Permian	Amphibians
		Coal Measures	Acrogens. (Ferns, Moss, Etc.)
		Sub. Carb.	
	Devonian	Upper Middle Lower	Fish
	Silurian	Upper Lower	Invertebrates
	Cambrian		
Proterozoic	Huronian		No Life
Archeozoic	Granitoid		No Life

An extended study of the harmony of this recent Science with the ancient writings of Moses creates a deep sense of awe at the harmony of Moses' account of Geology and the recent findings of Science. Note there are SIX CREATIVE DAYS in Moses and Modern Science alike; note that there is a close parallel between Genesis and Geology as to the KIND of life in each specific Day; and note that each CULMINATES WITH MAN DOMINANT ON THE SIXTH DAY. The Sixth day is the Day of Man: we will never enter into the seventh day until we enter into the Rest prepared for us by the finished work of Christ. We have not yet reached the Seventh Day, "there remaineth therefore a rest for the people of God." We could

spend hours on these harmonies here, but neither time nor space will allow, so we pass on.

A great deal has been said about the "poetic license of the Scripture." This phrase is usually given to cover a lax attitude toward the strict truth: and ~~as~~ such is NEVER applicable to the Bible. There are poetical books in the Bible, but even the poets of the Word speak with scientific accuracy. As an instance, Job 38:7—"When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy." This "Music of the Spheres" is usually taken for a mere poetic expression, but it is a scientific fact that the stars DO sing.

There is no such thing as sound or color. Pulsing and throbbing through space there go constant waves THAT MAY BE EITHER SOUND OR COLOR. In the deep silence of sidereal immensity they are present; in the desert wastes of uninhabited planets they are to be detected by the spectroscope, and if a man was there to see or hear he would have the same reactions we know as sound and color. But there is no sound, and no color.

Speeding through the ether of space there goes a rippling wave. If the speed of this wave and the length of the wave are right, there is the resultant reaction of sound or color. The same wave will make either: the same wave does make both. The human eye and ear are tuned to catch only an infinitely small part of these vibrations.

You know, of course, that there are known colors, called Ultra-Violet and Infra-Red that the eye cannot catch. These are the opposite ends of the Spectrum, above or below the colors man can see. There are now scientific instruments that will apprehend these ultra and infra colors, so the AIDED eye of man can detect

them. These are NOT colors, they are pulsations that go either too fast or too slow for the eye to detect.

If one of these waves comes at a certain number of beats per minute it strikes the eye as yellow. Control these pulsations to the correct frequency and length, and you can have any color of the spectrum at your own desire.

THESE SAME WAVES ON A DIFFERENT FREQUENCY MAKE SOUND. Also, there are "sound waves" the human ear cannot detect. Every ten year old boy knows the difference between "Radio Frequency" and "Audio Frequency." The broadcasting station sends out its program on a wave frequency no ear could ever apprehend. Pulsing across the void at the speed of light, waves travel at millions of beats per second. This is Radio Frequency. In the tubes of the receiving apparatus they are SLOWED DOWN TO THE RATE THE EAR CAN DETECT. This is Audio Frequency. If the speed of these waves could be altered sufficiently, instead of HEARING them we could SEE them. They are the same.

A noted British scientist has recently applied this principle to a machine that will enable blind folks to READ WITH THEIR EARS and deaf to HEAR WITH THEIR EYES. In this instrument or apparatus, the light rays are deflected off the page printed in colors, and then transformed to a speed that will strike the ear as a certain note of sound. When the blind operator learns the sound which each letter makes, he reads these sounds as a musician reads tones with his ear. A skilled operator can read any printed page in only one-fourth more time than a visual reader would occupy.

When sounds are spoken into the device their rate of travel is changed, and they strike the eye as colors.

The operator needs but to learn the tonal value of each color, and he then can HEAR WITH HIS EYES.

To every ray of light speeding across the void of space there is a corresponding sound that would STRIKE THE EAR ATTUNED TO HEAR IT. Some of these sounds must be of indescribable beauty. Tones of sweetness and strength such as man never dreamed of would meet the ear of a celestial being who dwelt where these sounds are. Every ray of light from every star sings. "THE MUSIC OF THE SPHERES" is a "SCIENTIFIC REALITY" and not a poetic imagination.

Some time ago, a young student in a certain Methodist University was reading in the Book of Jeremiah. Noting the 24th verse of the second chapter, "The wild ass used to the wilderness eateth the wind at her own desire:" he asked the Professor why the ass ate the wind. The Professor replied: "Because she is an ass, I suppose." Now the wild ass rises to rebuke many other asses who were wise above what is written, and the ass of the Bible had knowledge all along that was superior to those who scoffed at the Book.

Many times as a student I used to have to listen to learned discussions from Professors who talked at great length about "vestigial (?) organs" in man proving his animal ancestry. They still talk about these "vestigial (?) organs:" but there is one so-called vestigial organ they say no more about. I refer to the thyroid gland. It is the common practice of ignorance to belittle that which it does not understand. If we do not know the function of an organ, then, of course, it has none! This is the argument of ignorance as applied to the evolution of man. We deal now with the thyroid gland. It is one of the most essential parts of

the human anatomy. Its chief function seems to be the secretion of minute particles of iodide salts.

When the human system has an insufficient quantity of iodine in it, the whole system is depleted and below par. A fine form of Spring tonic is sodium iodide, or any of the other iodide salts. A specific in goiter is potassium iodide, and the governments of the earth are feeding this essential drug to their subjects where it is lacking. If there is a depleted amount of iodine in the system, goiter is the inevitable result. The world's supply of iodine is in the sea. The dwellers on or near the sea coast are not subject to goiter as those are who live inland and on mountain ranges, for two reasons. The first is because the sea foods all have a large quantity of iodine in them, and the other reason is THE SEA BREEZE. Verily, there is health and healing in the ocean breeze, for it carries a valuable materia medica in the form of iodine.

DID THE WILD ASS KNOW THIS? I cannot say. I suppose not. But the sea breeze has been known to carry iodine inland as far as sixty miles, and the wild ass knew enough to "snuff up" the sea winds when she needed a tonic. HOW MARVELOUSLY DOES THIS EXEMPLIFY THE SCIENTIFIC TRUTH OF THE WORD OF GOD, WHICH HAS A REASON EVEN FOR THE ACTIONS OF THE ANIMALS THAT PARADE ACROSS ITS PAGES! Truly, if man held his tongue, the rocks and beasts of nature would cry out.

One of the many great scientific fallacies that lent such weight to the theory of organic evolution in the past generation, ~~was~~ the fallacy of cell similarity. It was taught to me, with you and others, that all life was

a mere colony or co-hesion of living individuals called cells. Since these cells were composed of the same life substance, and were identical, there arose the fallacy of the continuity and relation of the life stream. From the lowest to the highest, all the Protozoa and all the Metazoa, are related as members of the same family because of cell similarity. There are unicellular creatures that are as truly alive and as vitally busy as we who are at the apex of the life stream crowning the zoological tree of life. The difference is one of DEGREE and not of KIND. Our cells are the same, only we have more of them. So I was taught, and so were countless hosts of others. You perhaps among others were never satisfied with this, and now you can sigh with relief. It is not so. NOT ONLY DO WE DIFFER FROM ANIMALS IN THE NUMBER OF CELLS WE POSSESS, BUT IN THE KIND OF CELLS AS WELL.

My teachers used to talk about the "Atomic Theory" and say it would always have to be a theory, for the atom was so unthinkably small we never could isolate it. But we have. Not only has the atom been isolated, but the comparatively enormous mass of the atom has been shattered into its infinitely smaller component particles, and the atom is now known to be a veritable solar system. Time and space will not now permit a resume of the physicists' new knowledge, I merely use this to remark that as the atom has been smashed and explored, so has the cell.

We know that cells differ one from the other. Indeed, at a very young age I suspected it, for I could tell the difference between hog and trout, beef and mutton, chicken and quail. If their cells were all the same whence came the different tastes? I used to puzzle

over that, and I noticed my teacher who was the greatest stickler over the cell basis theory wouldn't ever eat certain kind of meats! Well, they do differ.

The cell is today a world occupied by adventurers in research science. It is divided into continents and countries, lands and seas. One man explores the chromosomes, and is called a bio-geneticist. Another traces the fluctuations of the apparatus Golgi, and is called a cytologist. So thoroughly has the structure of the cell been shattered for research purposes, that men now are spending their lives in ONE SMALL SECTION of the cell. And we know one cell from another and they do differ.

OF COURSE THEY DO. ALMOST TWO THOUSAND YEARS AGO PAUL WROTE: "ALL FLESH IS NOT THE SAME FLESH, BUT THERE IS ONE FLESH OF MEN AND ANOTHER FLESH OF BEASTS, AND ANOTHER FLESH OF BIRDS, AND ANOTHER OF FISHES." (I Cor. 15:39). The Holy Ghost guided the hand that held that pen: so God's Word anticipated a modern (?) discovery some eighteen hundred years.

Some time ago in the State of Illinois I heard a man laugh at the Bible, for the ridiculous assertion of Jesus: "The very hairs of your head are all numbered?" (Matt. 10:30.) The man laughed at the idea of God counting the hairs of a man's head. Why not? Scientists do it: are they more capable than God who made the hair? The study of hair is a remarkable and fascinating pastime. The microscope will reveal the kind of hair under observation, and the bodily section from which it came. My microscope will show me A PHYSICAL DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE

HAIRS OF THE HEAD AND THE MUSTACHE OR BETWEEN THE WHISKERS AND THE EYEBROWS of any living creature. The finest hair I have ever seen came off a bat, that tiny golden mammal that flits about my California home in the cool of the summer twilight. The coarsest hair I ever saw came off the tip end of ■ prehistoric elephant's tail: and I have seen many, many other kinds between. When I make a microscopic examination of hair once, I never fail to recognize that particular hair the next time I see it. When I have many samples of hair for observation it is a simple matter to separate and classify them, and tell from what part of which animal they came. In the days of Christ, men perhaps did not know this bit of special knowledge, but He did. "The hairs of your head are all numbered" by science; and your eyebrows and your mustache, and your beard, and your eyelashes, and if you have a hair on ■ mole that comes under a different catalogue! "The hairs of your head are all numbered" by science, WHY NOT BY OUR FATHER WHO ART IN HEAVEN?

It is truly remarkable how much of our "modern" knowledge is contained in the Bible. In the grim years when the horror of the plague swept across Europe with a devastation awful to remember, they suffered needlessly for lack of certain present information. What MODERN doctor would think of combating ■ plague without recourse to quarantine? Or what Board of Health in any city would allow contagious disease to rage without the control of quarantine and fumigation? This is "modern" procedure.

Yet we read the same in the Old Testament. When the Children of Israel were on their historic hegira to the Promised Land, they found ■ case of contagious

disease in the horde. Moses asked God for guidance, and was instructed to quarantine the patient, and before he was released they were further instructed to fumigate the man and all his possessions. Across the span of forty centuries the medical practice of the twentieth century A. D. meets the companionship of the twentieth century B. C.!

In the book of Ecclesiastes the ancient preacher phonates the modern law of evaporation. He says, "all the rivers run into the sea, yet the sea is not full. Unto the place from whence the rivers came, thither they return again." They certainly do! Out of the boundless sea the sun draws the clouds of moisture. The winds waft these out over the mountain tops from whence the rivers came. Then they run on back to the sea to complete their cycle again and this they have been doing since time began.

In the seventeenth chapter of Acts, Paul the Apostle states modern knowledge in ancient words. In the twenty-sixth verse, he says God has made of one blood all men that on the earth do dwell. This is literally true.

We know that man is one genus, the genus "Homo". There is only one species of this genus, the species "sapiens." Every different race of man is simply a variety of the genus "Homo sapiens." They may be marked by a difference of color, the slant of the eyes, the shape of the zygomatic arch, the cephalic, index, language, custom or culture, but they are truly "of one blood."

This is modern knowledge. A short time ago we knew so little about blood that many a murderer escaped the consequences of his deed by pleading that his blood-stained garments were dyed with blood of some butchered animal. That plea will never work now,

for science has solved the mysteries of blood. With the invention of the sphygmograph, the haemoglobino-meter, the oscilloscope, and other technical instruments common to the laboratory, we can tell the difference between the various kinds of blood. If you were to bring into the modern research laboratory a drop of blood from a horse, a cow, a chicken, a sparrow, and a man, in a surprisingly short time the scientists would tell you infallibly which drop came from which creature. But if you brought into the best equipped laboratory in the world five drops of human blood, one from a Negro, one from a Chinese, one from an Englishman, one from a German, and one from a Malay; there is no method of technique by which one of these drops of blood could be told from another. All we could say would be: "Here are five drops of HUMAN blood:" but chemically there is no difference.

How did Paul the Apostle know this? He probably did not. But a greater Intellect than Paul inspired this writer, as in countless other cases.

The argument is not yet finished, and probably never will be. The ardent efforts of earnest men are adding to our store of wisdom and knowledge day after day, and we are catching up to the Bible point by point. The more we learn, the more clearly we see that there is a divine harmony between the Bible and TRUE Science. The gem of truth has many facets, and the resultant gleams are many hued, but they all harmonize. The facts of nature, classified under the industry of science, must and will ever bear record to the truth of the Book that is God's Word.

OTHER PAPERS BY THE SAME AUTHOR

- "Spiritism in the Light of Science and the Bible"
- "Monkeyshines: Fakes, Fables and Facts Concerning Evolution"
- "The Theories of Evolution and the Facts of Paleontology"
- "The Facts of Biology and the Theories of Evolution"
- "A Scientist's Viewpoint of the Virgin Birth"
- "Embryology and the Recapitulation Theory"
- "Modern Science, Noah's Ark, and the Deluge"
- "Modern Science, Jonah and the Whale"
- "Modern Science and the First Fundamental"
- "Modern Science in an Ancient Book"
- "Modern Science and the Long Day of Joshua"
- "Modern Science and the Prologue of Genesis"
- "Modern Science and the First Day of Genesis"
- "Modern Science and the Second Day of Genesis"
- "Modern Science and the Third Day of Genesis"
- "Modern Science and the Fourth Day of Genesis"
- "Modern Science and the Fifth Day of Genesis"
- "Modern Science and the Sixth Day of Genesis"
- "The Trial and Death of Jesus" (Outlines for Study)
- "Harmony of Science and the Scriptures"
- "The Theories of Evolution and the Facts of Human Antiquity"
- "The Credibility of the Chronology of the Bible"
- "Syllabus of Bible Study in Christian Evidences"
- A Debate (The Creative Days were Literal Solar Days)
(All the above list 25c each.)
- "Modern Science and the Youth of Today"
(10c per copy.)
- "Voices from the Silent Centuries"
(50c)

Order from

RESEARCH SCIENCE BUREAU, INC.

c/o Glendale Printers

216 South Brand Boulevard

Glendale, California

